



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/698,379	10/27/2000	Teresa Martineau	MS150499.1	6348
27195	7590 04/21/2006		EXAMINER	
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP			FADOK, MARK A	
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CLEVELAND, OH 44114			3625	
		· .	DATE MAILED: 04/21/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/698,379	MARTINEAU ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Mark Fadok	3625		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I.  nely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 Ja</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.			
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-49</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>12-40</u> is/are withdraw  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 41-49</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Applicati	on Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
2)  Notice (3)  Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal Pa 6)  Other:			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Amendment

The examiner is in receipt of applicant's response to office action mailed 11/22/2005, which was received 1/26/2006. Acknowledgement is made to the amendment to claims 1,2,3,7,8 and 11, the withdrawal of claims 12-40 and the addition of new claims 41-49. The new claims are considered parallel to claims 1-11 and will therefore be examined. In regards to applicant's amendment and remarks, they were found to be persuasive, however after further searching and consideration the following rejection necessitated by amendment follows:

#### **Examiner's Note**

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers or figures in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

### Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 6 the examiner believes that the phrase "that stores at" should be "that stores". Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 09/698,379

Art Unit: 3625

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Page 3

Claims 1-10 and 41-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Morgan et al. (US 6,073,140).

In regards to claims 1-10 and 41-49, Morgan teaches all the elements of the instant

claims, For instance, Morgan discloses a method and system for the creation.

enhancement and update of data on a customer database using data from a central

database and persistent keys that are linked to each data structure is disclosed. The

persistent keys allow the matching of equivalent data structures between the remote

and central databases so that enhancement data from the central database can be

overlaid onto the customer database. The persistent keys also make the update of data

on the customer database more efficient, since key matching allows the transfer of only

the data that is needed to update the customer database. The central database may

physically contain all of the enhancement data, or may use a central database manager

to transparently link a group of physically remote databases using the persistent keys.

Data may be transferred from the central database to the customer database either in

batch mode or in a near real-time mode through a direct table join. The linking feature of

the persistent keys further allows the linkage of the customer database and the central

database to create a multidimensional database (abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Application/Control Number: 09/698,379 Page 4

Art Unit: 3625

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan further in view of Kalagnanam (6,873,967).

Morgan teaches accessing data using keys to a central database, but does not specifically mention that there is a gift finder component that accesses a user attribute database using attributes related to an owner and extracting data from the item database. Kalagnanam teaches using attribute preference categories to assist in gift giving decisions (col 1, lines 35-50). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include in Morgan the gift finder elements of claim 11, because this would add sensitivity to the preferences of a person purchasing a gift from a platform incorporating Morgan's persistent keys and would give the shopping assistant of Kalagnanam the appearance that all the data resides at the central location (Morgan col 6, lines 25-30).

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 and 41-49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mark Fadok** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-6755**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Thursday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wynn Coggins** can be reached on (571) 272-7159.

Art Unit: 3625

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **receptionist** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3600**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

[Official communications; including

After Final communications labeled

"Box AF"]

(571) 273-6755

[Informal/Draft communications, labeled

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Mark Fadok

**Primary Examiner**